

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:

Paul S. Collins

Serial No.: 10/039,015

Filed: January 2, 2002

For: Coil Spring Extension
Mechanism for a PC Card§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Art Unit: 2833

Examiner: Alexander Gilman

Atty Docket: ITL.0691US
P13222

Box AF

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231**REPLY TO FINAL REJECTION**

Sir:

In response to the final office action mailed November 14, 2002, reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

REMARKS

The office action contends that Johnson does disclose a catch. The Examiner alternately contends either that a spring biased catch as claimed is inherently present or, in fact, it is actually present.

The assertion that "Johnson should be inherently spring biased," "to prevent any jam in a case of a small inclination of the traveler (24) from a linear movement" is based on hindsight, not inherency. Here, taking the benefits of the claimed invention, the Examiner simply asserts that the prior art must have done the claimed invention because it is good. But, of course, the prior art did not do it because it no where mentions the possibility of using a spring biased catch. The prior art simply did not realize the benefits and the Examiner cannot contend that it inherently does so when there is no mention of the possibility.

Date of Deposit: November 21, 2002

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington DC 20231.


Cynthia L. Hayden